



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,378	07/28/2001	Shi-You Ding	NREL 01-35	9985

23712 7590 10/28/2005

PAUL J WHITE, SENIOR COUNSEL
NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY (NREL)
1617 COLE BOULEVARD
GOLDEN, CO 80401-3393

EXAMINER

RAO, MANJUNATH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/917,378	Applicant(s) DING ET AL.	
	Examiner Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10,11,26-34,43,44,63,64,67,68 and 70-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-34,43,44,63,64,67,68 and 70-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1652

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 10-11, 26-34, 43-44, and 63-64, 67-68, 70-73 are currently pending and are present for examination.

Applicants' amendments and arguments filed on 8-19-05, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. Examiner appreciates applicant's explanation of the invention. However, Examiner assures the applicant that the Examiner has fully understood the invention by reading the specification and has the better grasp of the metes and bounds of the claims. Examiner would also like to comment that while the claims are read in light of the specification, the contents of the specification are not in any way considered to be limitation of the claims. And, as required by the MPEP, each claim in the patent application is given as broad an interpretation as scientifically possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 64 and claims 65-73 depending therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 64 recites the phrase "comprising a catalytic domain glycoside hydrolase family 5 (GH5)" and "the sequence of SEQ ID NO:3". The metes and bounds of the above phrase is not clear to the Examiner. The phrase as written does not make it clear as to what specific catalytic activity is encompassed by the above phrase.

Art Unit: 1652

The term glycosidase is a very broad term and includes the hydrolysis of more than one type of glycosidic linkage, i.e., alpha 1, 4, or β 1,3-, or β 1,4-, etc. or whether even the activity of the mannanase is that of α -mannanase activity or beta-mannanase activity etc. Therefore the scope of the above phrase is still not clear to the Examiner.

Furthermore, the phrase "the sequence of SEQ ID NO:3" is also not clear because it does not unambiguously state that the catalytic domain indeed has the amino acid sequence, SEQ ID NO:3. Examiner suggests deleting the word "of" in the above phrase and make a direct reference to SEQ ID NO:3.

In response to the above rejection, applicant argues that with the inclusion of the work "consisting" instead of comprising for the catalytic domain glycoside material, the metes and bounds are clear now. Examiner respectfully disagrees. What is still not clear is what specific catalytic activity is encompassed? While the composition claimed comprises a Man A polypeptide having mannanase activity, this mannanase activity could be either that of α -mannanase activity or beta-mannanase activity etc. Therefore, inclusion of the work "consisting" has not provided any remedy for the above rejection.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 26-34, 43-44 and 63-65, 67-68, 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a mannanase with β 1,4-mannosidase activity having the amino acid sequence SEQ ID NO:1 or comprising a sequence

Art Unit: 1652

of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order and a fusion protein comprising the above amino acid sequences, does not reasonably provide enablement for any such enzyme or fusion proteins comprising an amino acid sequence that has at least 70% or 90% sequence identity to amino acid sequence SEQ ID NO:1 or comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order, does not reasonably provide enablement for such a protein comprising any catalytic domain of any glycoside hydrolase of GH5 family. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claim(s).

Claims 26-34, 43-44 and 63-68, 73 are so broad as to encompass any mannanase comprising an amino acid sequence having 70% or 90% identity to SEQ ID NO:1 or a polypeptide comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order or a protein comprising any catalytic domain of any glycoside hydrolase of GH5 family. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of mannanases/glycosyl hydrolases broadly encompassed by the claims. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain

Art Unit: 1652

the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to a single mannanase comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order. It would require undue experimentation of the skilled artisan to make and use the claimed polypeptides. The specification is limited to teaching the use of SEQ ID NO:1 or polypeptide comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order as a mannanase but provides no guidance with regard to the making of variants and mutants or with regard to other uses. In view of the great breadth of the claim, amount of experimentation required to make the claimed polypeptides, the lack of guidance, working examples, and unpredictability of the art in predicting function from a polypeptide primary structure (e.g., see Ngo et al. in *The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction*, 1994, Merz et al. (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495, Ref: U, Form-892), the claimed invention would require undue experimentation. As such, the specification fails to teach one of ordinary skill how to use the full scope of the polypeptides encompassed by this claim.

While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, in order to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications, as encompassed by the instant claims, the positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any

Art Unit: 1652

tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of any mannanase with 70% or 90% identity to the enzymes comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the protein structure which may be modified without affecting mannanase activity; (B) the general tolerance of mannanases to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino acid residue in any mannanase polypeptide with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; and (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including mannanases with an enormous number of amino acid modifications to SEQ ID NO:1 or polypeptide comprising a sequence of SEQ ID NO:3:4:5 in that order. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of mannanases having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

In response to the previous Office action, applicants have traversed the above rejection arguing that the requirements for enablement has been met. Applicants argue that "it is not any

Art Unit: 1652

mannanase that is under consideration here but instead, the purified ManA polypeptide consisting of a catalytic domain glycoside hydrolase family 5 (GH5), a carbohydrate binding domain III, and a carbohydrate binding domain II, in that order” and accordingly the scope of the claim is not in doubt. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Contrary to applicant’s argument, the enzyme as claimed comprises a genus which broadly encompasses mutants and variants and recombinants of a Mannanase enzyme for which applicants have provided no enabling disclosure. Therefore, as explained in the above rejection claims continue to be non-enabled. Hence the rejection is maintained.

Claims 65, 67-68 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 65, 67-68 and 73 are directed to composition comprising polypeptides having any glycosidase catalytic domain and two carbohydrate binding domains. Claims 65, 67-68 and 73 are rejected under this section of 35 USC 112 because the claims are directed to a genus of polypeptides including modified polypeptide sequences, modified by at least one of deletion, addition, insertion and substitution of an amino acid residues in said polypeptides, that have not been disclosed in the specification. No description has been provided of the polypeptide sequences encompassed by the claim. No information, beyond the characterization of SEQ ID NO:1 and 3, 4, 5, has been provided by applicants which would indicate that they had possession of the claimed genus of polypeptides. The specification does not contain any

Art Unit: 1652

disclosure of the structure of all the polypeptide sequences including fragments and variants within the scope of the claimed genus. The genus of polypeptides claimed is a large variable genus including peptides which can have a wide variety of structures. Therefore many structurally unrelated polypeptides are encompassed within the scope of these claims. The specification discloses only a single species (SEQ ID NO:1, comprising SEQ ID NO:3,4,5) of the claimed genus which is insufficient to put one of skill in the art in possession of the attributes and features of all species within the claimed genus. Therefore, one skilled in the art cannot reasonably conclude that applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at www.uspto.gov.

In response to the previous Office action, applicants have traversed the above rejection arguing that “it is not in fact the case that these claims are directed to a genus of polypeptides including modified polypeptide sequences that have not been disclosed for the reason that SEQ ID NO:1 and 3, 4, and 5 are clearly set forth in Table 1 on page 18... and the contents of these tables are clearly representative without undue experimentation for the contention that inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed”. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Contrary to the applicant’s argument it can be readily seen that none of the claims rejected herein are limited to the SEQ ID NO mentioned by the applicant, rather they read on a genus of polypeptides including variants, mutants and recombinants of Mannanases or of SEQ ID NO:1, 3, 4, and 5. Furthermore, applicants do not provide any evidence that the

Art Unit: 1652

members of the genus have related or identical structure on the record and there is no reason to believe that the structure of SEQ ID NO: 1 is indeed representative of the entire genus.

Applicants also argue that the contents of the tables in the specification need not be recited in the claims since these claims by established patent law must be read in light of the disclosure. While Examiner agrees that the claims must be read in light of the specification, Examiner cannot assume that the limitations or characteristics of the polypeptide in this case automatically limits the claims. While claims are read in light of the specification, the claims are examined giving a broad interpretation of what is claimed.

As discussed in the written description guidelines, the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. **Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus.** Satisfactory disclosure of a representative number depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed. For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing

Art Unit: 1652

only one species within the genus. In the instant case the claimed genera of Claims 65, 67-68 and 73 includes species which are widely variant in structure. The genus Claims 65, 67-68 and 73 is structurally diverse as it encompasses polypeptides from all or any source including variants, mutants and recombinants of any mannanase. As such, the description of solely the functional features present in all members of the genus is not sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus. Therefore the above rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Claims 10 and 11 are allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1652

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0939. The Examiner can normally be reached on 7.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Manjunath N. Rao', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652

October 25, 2005